

then replay the context-full test script and construct forms to simulate a user's interaction with the application. See, Specification, page 21, lines 4-18; page 22, lines 3-12; page 27, lines 12-18; and Figure 7.

Applicants submit that Quinlan and Sidles, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the parsing tool, recorder, and replay engine recited in independent claims 1 and 29-31. With respect to Quinlan, Applicants submit that Quinlan discloses that the "remote form" (*i.e.*, the static portion of an HTML page) is cached and merged with the data returned from the server in its response prior to displaying the merged data in a browser to the user. (Quinlan, col. 7, lines 1-16.) Therefore, Quinlan merely discloses a system that can handle static forms, which cannot cope with client side executable code that changes the HTML without contacting the server system 20. With respect to Sidles, Applicants submit that Sidles discloses that the automated form filling system 200 must still display the filled-in form for "review and possible correction by the user prior to final submission to the merchant." (Sidles, paragraph 0080.) Neither Quinlan nor Sidles disclose a system that is capable of recording a context-full test script, which, when the context-full test script is replayed, the system will build a form to be submitted (*i.e.*, resulting in a subsequent state of the network application) free of interaction with a user.

As demonstrated above, neither Quinlan nor Sidles, either individually or in combination, disclose the parsing tool, recorder, and replay engine recited in claims 1 and 29-31. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Quinlan and Sidles fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claims 1 and 29-31. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 29-31 are patentable over the combination of Quinlan and Sidles.

Instead, the system inspects all forms in all of the documents in the session history. See, Specification, page 25, lines 18-19.

Applicants submit that neither Quinlan nor Sidles discloses or suggests the comparing, generating, choosing, and applying steps recited in claim 28. With respect to Quinlan, Applicant submit that Quinlan discloses that if a form has already been requested via a HTTP request and is cached, then component 10-42 reads the cached form from the cache instead of having to re-process the form from the HTML data. (Quinlan, col. 11, lines 45-58.) Applicants submit that Quinlan merely checks the cache to see if the form is present (*i.e.*, looks for an identical match). Since Quinlan is only looking for an identical match, Quinlan neither discloses nor suggests “generating data based upon the differences resulting from the comparing [of each form in the session history and the form to be submitted],” as recited in claim 28. Therefore, since Quinlan lacks the generating step, Applicants submit that Quinlan neither discloses nor suggests “choosing one of the forms in said session history that has the greatest similarity to the form to be submitted,” as recited in claim 28. Thus, Quinlan also lacks the applying step recited in claim 28.

With respect to Sidles, Applicants submit that Sidles discloses that the automated form filling system 200 compares the field names of the form 126 with the dictionary 1000 list of field names to see if it can find a match. If there is no exact match, fuzzy logic 248 tries to “guess” how to fill the remaining data fields of form 126 (Sidles, paragraph 0040.) If the dictionary 1000 and fuzzy logic 248 are unable to complete all the fields of the form 126, then the system 200 looks in history database 1200 to see if the specific site 104 and form 126 have been previously filled by a human person. (Sidles, paragraph 0041.) Accordingly, Sidles does not generate “data

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated January 12, 2006 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: April 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Louis J. DelJuidice
Registration No.: 47,522
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicants